

REMARKS

Claims 24 and 26-42 are pending in the instant application. Claims 24, 31, 34, and 40 are independent claims. A minor amendment is made to claim 24 for clarity. All of the pending claims stand rejected in the pending office action. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24 and 26-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,010,587 to Shiimori (Shiimori).

Shiimori fails to teach or suggest several limitations of claim 1. For example, the Office fails to cite to a teaching or suggestion of transferring to the designated device the font structure data lacked by the designated device and the text data, wherein the designated device stores the received font structure data in the client device. At the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action, the Office lists limitation (iv) but fails to provide a citation to where in Shiimori the limitation is described. As described herein below, the process described in Shiimori does not transfer font structure data lacked by the designated device to the designated device.

Shiimori describes a method of creating an edited image using fonts capable of being employed by both a client computer and a server computer. (Abstract) A client computer selects a service the client wishes to perform (FIG. 4 at 43; col. 4, lines 51-55), such as a post card editing service, a business card editing service, or a poster editing service. The client computer transmits the selected request along with information about the client computer to the server (FIG. 4 at 44; col. 4, lines 56-58). Example information about the client computer is shown in

FIG. 5, where the client computer transmits its operating system, OS 1, and five fonts useable at the client computer (col. 4, lines 60-62).

The server contains a plurality of font files, as shown in FIG. 3, where each font file contains fonts suited to a specific service according to operating system. As shown in FIG. 3, Font File 1 contains fonts for the post card service, Font File 2 contains fonts for the business card service, and Font File 3 contains fonts for the poster service. As shown in the expansion of Font File 1 containing fonts for the post card service, four fonts are listed for operating system OS 1 for the poster service, and two fonts are listed for operating system OS 2 for the poster service.

Upon receiving a service request and client information, the server executes a font-list list creation process (FIG. 4 at 52; described in detail in FIG. 10). As discussed at col. 7, lines 31-58, describing FIG. 10:

FIG. 10 is a flowchart illustrating processing for creating the font list. This processing corresponds to the processing of step 52 in FIG. 4.

When data representing a service and client information transmitted from the client computer 1 are received by the server 30 (step 91), reference is had to the menu file of the server 30 and a search is conducted for the font file corresponding to the service that has been selected by the user of the client computer 1 (step 92). For example, if the service that has been selected by the user is the "POSTCARD CREATION" service, then Font File 1 is found.

When the font file corresponding to the service is found, then this font file is searched for the font names grouped under an OS identical with the OS representing the OS information contained in the client information (step 93). If the OS information indicates OS 1, then the font file is searched for "MS GOTHIC, MS MINCHO, DFP SEMICURSIVE, DFP BLOCK MEDIUM" grouped under OS 1.

Furthermore, the font names found are searched for fonts that are the same as those represented by the font information that has been transmitted from the client computer 1 (step 94). For example, if the font information that has been transmitted from the client computer 1 is as shown in FIG. 5, then "MS GOTHIC, MS MINCHO and DFP SEMICURSIVE" are eventually found.

The fonts thus found constitute the font list, which is then transmitted from the server 30 to the client computer 1.

Thus, the server performs a lookup on the font file corresponding to the requested service and finds the fonts listed for the operating system specified in the client information (e.g., MS Gothic, MS Mincho, DFP Semicursive, DFP Block Medium, for a request for the postcard service that indicates operating system OS 1). The server compares the listed fonts with the fonts identified as being compatible with the client in the client information (FIG. 5), and the server creates a font list containing the fonts that appear in both the font file lookup and the client information (FIG. 6). The server transmits the font list (FIG. 6) to the client (FIG. 4 at 53), and the client computer then possesses a list of fonts that are capable of being employed by both the client computer and the server. The compatible fonts may then be used to populate menus in the requested service's GUI (e.g., the fonts appearing on the compatible font list of FIG. 6 populate dropdown box 72 in FIG. 8).

At no time in Shiiomori is any font structure data lacked by a designated device transferred. Only lists of certain font names are transferred in order to identify a set of common compatible fonts between the client computer and the server. Because the Office Action fails to point to a teaching of this feature, and Shiiomori clearly does not contain such a teaching or suggestion, it is respectfully requested that the § 103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 31, 34, and 40 recite similar features of determining whether a device is missing a font and transferring or not transferring the missing font based on that determination. Because Shiiomori only transmits lists of font names of fonts with which the client device is compatible and does not transmit any font structure data, it is respectfully requested that the § 103 rejections of claim 31, 34, and 40 be withdrawn.

It is noted that the applicant has not provided arguments with respect to the dependent claims in the instant application. This is done without prejudice to the applicant's right to

present such arguments at any point in the future. In addition, because each of the dependent claims depends from an independent claim that is itself allowable, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as are the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, the pending claims are allowable. The examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)
Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506